



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLII, 1.

WHOLE No. 165.

I.—AND AND OR.

Leo, *Hermes* XLII (1907) 52, remarking that in *Ciris* 395 and *Georg.* 4, 389 we should expect *vel* for *et*, says, "Darüber bedarf es einer Untersuchung." The matter has been touched on here and there—at most length, I think, by Wagner, *Quaest. Verg.* XXXVI, and by Wickham in his edition of Horace. Prof. W. A. Merrill, *A. J. P.* XXI (1900) 185, laid down a rule for the Lucretian use of *que* and *ve* with forms of *qui*; Klotz, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* XXXV (1915) 816, gave some examples of the Latin use of the copulative particle, for which editors, as he observes, are prone inconsiderately to substitute the disjunctive. The examples I give of both particles are drawn partly from other languages; it has seemed to me that even an imperfect comparison of other usage is helpful toward understanding variations or singularities in Latin.

Bentley on *Hor. Epod.* 5.33 explained *bis terque* as equivalent to *saepe*, *bis terve* as equivalent to *raro*. Wickham on *Hor. A. P.* 358, while professing to accept Bentley's definition, gave really a different turn to the phrases, rendering each not, like Bentley, by a less definite word, but with emphasis on the precise value of the numerals, *bis terque* by "twice or thrice at least," *bis terve* by "twice or thrice at most"; similarly Tyrrell on *Cic. Q. fr.* 3.8.6. But Latin expresses "at most" by *summum* or (*cum*) *plurimum*; "at least" by (*cum*) *minimum*; when these limiting words are not used, the combination of two numerals may have, not in Latin only, an indefinite sense, the notion of comparative rarity or frequency being inferred from the context. Two interpretations in Bentley's sense of such combinations are

Schol. Plat. Gorg. 498 E παροιμία δις καὶ τρίς τὸ καλὸν ὅτι χρὴ περὶ τῶν καλῶν πολλάκις λέγειν, and Dig. 1.3.5 ad ea potius debet aptari ius quae et frequenter et facile quam quae perraro eveniunt. τὸ γὰρ ἄπαξ ἢ δις, ut ait Theophrastus, παραβαίνουσιν οἱ νομοθέται. But an implication not of rarity but of comparative frequency is contained in Thuc. 5.10.9 ἡμύνοντο καὶ δις ἢ τρίς προσβαλόντα, Cic. Att. 6.1.2 bis terve ὑπομεμφιμοίρους litteras miserat, and Shakespeare, Henry V, 5.1.65 "I have seen you gleeking and galling at this gentleman twice or thrice"; cp. Mart. 8.3.1 sex septemve libelli est nimium, which means "so many as," not "so few." The Oxford Dictionary recognizes an indefinite sense for both the "and" and the "or" combinations: VII 118 "*Once or twice*, a few times; *once and again*, more than once, twice (or oftener)"; X 527 "*Once or twice, twice or thrice*, used indefinitely: a few times."

In strictness "or" gives only a choice between two numbers, "and" expresses either (1) the actual attainment of the higher number or (2) the desirability of its attainment: (1) N. T. Thess. 1.2.18 ἠθελήσαμεν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἄπαξ καὶ δις, Cic. Att. 14.18.1 adductus sum tuis et unis et alteris litteris,¹ Plin. Ep. 4.3.1 semel atque iterum consul fuisti, Macaulay, *Horatius*, "And thrice and four times tugged amain"; (2) Plat. Gorg. 498 E καὶ δις γάρ τοι καὶ τρίς φασι καλὸν εἶναι τὰ καλὰ λέγειν, Georg. 2.399 terque quaterque solum scindendum. But it seems to me impossible to make a distinction between the use of the two particles which shall be valid for the following paired passages: Thuc. 1.82.2 διελθόντων ἐτῶν καὶ δύο καὶ τριῶν, 4.124.4 δύο μὲν ἢ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐπέσχον; Hor. C. 1.31.13 ter et quater anno, Suet. Aug. 78 in illo temporis spatio ter aut quater; Mart. 10.11.6 lotam, ut multum, terque quaterque togam,² 12.3.17 versus

¹ There is, I think, a like use of *et unus et alter* in Hor. S. 1.6.101 where the first *et* is sometimes explained as postpositive with *ducendus*. Cicero probably means *duabus*; Horace's phrase is indefinite like Martial's, 1.103.6 calceus est sarta terque quaterque cute, where also the particle is doubled. Latin is not averse to a doubling which looks odd because our stock rendering of the doubled particle is not applicable; so of *et* Liv. 35.29.3, 40.16.8, Trebell. Gallien. 18.1; of *nec* Hor. A. P. 8, Paul. Sent. 1.12.4 in caput domini patronive nec servus nec libertus interrogari potest; of *vel* ibid. 2.9.1 servus vel filius familias . . . in solidum vel patrem vel dominum obligat.

² A passage which tells against Wickham's view; for *ut multum*,

duo tresve legantur; Tac. D. 21 vix in una et altera oratiuncula, G. 6 vix uni alterive. The ultimate concurrence in meaning of the two combinations—or rather the ultimate trespassing of “and” on the domain of “or”—is sharply illustrated by Plut. Lysand. 10 δύο καὶ τρεῖς τριήρεις ἃς ἔπεμψε κατασκόπους beside Xen. Anab. 4.7.5 δύο ἢ τρεῖς ὥλισμένους and by Cat. Agr. 65 postridie aut post tertium diem quam (olea) lecta erit, (oleum) facito . . . si gelicidia erunt cum oleam coges, triduum atque quadriduum post oleum facito. The desperate attempts to find for Soph. El. 726 τελοῦντες ἕκτον ἔβδομόν τ’ ἤδη δρόμον an explanation which shall not admit an illogical “and” in place of a logical “or” show how the grammatical mind revolts against such a license. Musgrave’s “τε pro ἤ,” like Serv. Aen. 2.37 que pro ve posuit, is too crudely expressed; it is better to say that the two combinations may often be used indifferently and that this indifference is sometimes carried further than a scrupulous conscience can approve.

A correction is made by *potius* with a disjunctive, “or rather”: Cic. Verr. 6.74, Att. 4.1.1, Fam. 12.29.1. An emphatic addition, sometimes virtually a correction, is made by *atque adeo* “and indeed”: Liv. 10.5.14, Cic. Verr. 3, 157. The two expressions start from different points of view, but it may happen that neither Latin nor English would find any difficulty in substituting the one for the other; compare Verr. 4.71 redemptorem decumarum atque adeo aratorum dominum with 6.76 hostem populi Romani seu potius communem hostem, and Verr. 4.11 magna atque adeo maxima with Q. fr. 2.13.1 magna vel potius maxima. When the second word or phrase is not a more emphatic expression of the first, but a contradiction of it, our idiom demands the disjunctive particle, as in Verr. 4.173 quae est ergo ista ratio aut quae potius ista amentia. Even here Latin admits the copulative: Cic. R. A. 29 hoc consilio atque adeo hac amentia, Caecil. 68 hoc institui atque adeo institutum referri, Rhet. ad Her. 4.36 vicerunt atque adeo victi sunt. See Tyrrell on Att. 1.7.9, 15.3.3, and contrast Georg. 1.24 with Ov. Tr. 3.1.77. The change of sense, the exclusion of the first

virtually equivalent to *sumum*, is used with the *que*, not the *ve*, combination. But I have not found *sumum* or *plurimum* used with the copulative particle. (*Terque quaterque* is Schneidewin’s reading and that of the MSS; *terve quaterve* Friedl., Lindsay, following Haupt.)

word or phrase, may be brought out more clearly by a following explanatory clause; so Rhet. ad Her. l. c., Verr. 3.89, cp. Plin. Ep. 2.17.25. The equivalence of the two corrective phrases is shown by interchange, *sive* with *adeo*, *ac*, rarely *et*, with *potius*³: Verr. 2.87 huius improbissimi furti sive adeo nefariae praedae, R. A. 110 fide ac potius perfidia. The equivalence of *adeo* and *potius* with the copulative appears from Cic. Planc. 48 posco atque adeo flagito, Legg. 1.5 postulatur et flagitatur potius. The same corrective sense belongs to *immo*: Att. 6.2.7 Brutum tuum, immo nostrum, Fam. 12.16.1 adulescente tuo atque adeo nostro, Plin. Ep. 6.18.3 Firmanis tuis ac iam potius nostris; cp. Sen. Ep. 58.1 with Plin. Ep. 4.18.1, Quintil. 2.2.8 with Fam. 4.3.1. Occasional minglings occur: Rhet. ad Her. 4.55, Cic. Clu. 172 atque adeo potius, Lucr. 1.1019 sive adeo potius, Greg. Tur. H. Fr. praef. atque immo potius.

Familiar to us is the use of the copulative in "killed and wounded" and like expressions. Sir John Moore, *Diary*, uses "or" only twice, where the loss was of the whole force: ii 14 "Not a man of the French escaped being killed, wounded or taken," 96 "He had captured or sunk them all." In twenty-four passages, where the loss is partial, Moore uses "and": ii 9 "Many officers and men were killed and wounded. Our loss this day amounted to thirteen hundred killed and disabled." Mr. Fortescue, *Hist. Brit. Army*, vols. ii-iii, employs "and" much oftener than "or," (102:12, if I have counted rightly), but uses them indifferently of a partial loss: ii 329 "Nearly four hundred had fallen killed and wounded," 380 "Twenty-eight officers fell killed or wounded." In iii 446 he writes, "The gunners were killed or wounded almost to a man" (practically all); on the other hand, Clarendon, the third volume of whose *History of the Rebellion* I have glanced through for comparison, has "He killed and wounded the whole party except some ten," and again "He killed and wounded and dispersed them all." The few examples in Grant's *Memoirs* show his use to agree with Moore's; so too the four instances in Caesar: B. G. 5.43.5, 7.88.7 *atque* with *magnus numerus*, 2.25.1, B. C. 3.38.4 *aut* with *omnes*. The author of B. Alex., like Mr. Fortescue, uses either particle

³ *Ac* with *potius* we translate varyingly by "or," "and," or "but"; Holden *De Officiis*, *Index*, says too bluntly "*ac* = *sed*."

with respect to a partial loss (18.4 *que*, 46.5 *aut*), the disjunctive of a loss of the whole, 76.4. But B. Afr. 25.3 *capiti interfectique sunt omnes*, like Clarendon.⁴ My incomplete collection of examples from Livy shows twenty-four instances of the copulative, twenty-one of the disjunctive.⁵ I have not found him using the copulative with *omnis* (cp. 24.16.4, 37.24.10); but he does not hesitate to employ it of a total loss, so 36.44.6 *deiectis caesisque propugnatoribus*, which is less clear than 26.40.8 *pulsis custodibus aut caesis*. Finally I note Cic. Fam. 15.4.8 *occisi captique*, Vell. 2.12.5 *caesa aut capta*, 46.1 *caesis et captis*.

We have here two modes of distributing losses under the different heads—by summing up with “and” and by dividing with “or.” A third way is by the asyndetic repetition of nouns or adverbs: B. Afr. 50.4 *quos Caesaris equites consecuti partim interfecerunt, partim vivorum sunt potiti*, Liv. 33.36.3 *multi occisi, multi capti*. Outside of the military sphere an illustration of all three forms of expression is afforded by local adverbs or phrases. In Latin, besides the asyndetic *huc illuc* we find often *huc atque illuc*; the disjunctive I have noted only in Sen. D. 5.6.6 *in hanc aut illam partem transferre*, Tac. G. 44 *mutabile, ut res poscit, hinc vel illinc remigium*, Plin. Ep. 2.17.18 *hac vel illac cadit*.⁶ The distributive force of the particles is brought out by comparison of Tennyson’s “This way and that dividing the swift mind” with the passage on which it is based, Æn. 8.20 *atque animum nunc huc celerem, nunc dividit illuc*, and of Cic. de Or. 1.184 *huc atque illuc intuentem* (Bunyan, “he looked

⁴Unless this is an abbreviated way of saying *capta oppida interfectique sunt omnes*. In 61.3 *pulsi convulneratique* the writer perhaps means that all were wounded as well as routed: this at any rate is what is expressly denoted in 52.3 *eos convulneratos usque in castra regia repulerunt multosque ex iis interfecerunt*. The other instances in B. Afr. are, of the copulative 17.2, 41.1, of the disjunctive 63.5, 85.6, 93.3, 95.2.

⁵*Atque* 34.32.18; *et* 2.17.2, 35.29.3, 38.49.11, 40.16.8; *que* 2.47.9, 5.26.8, 6.2.12, 23.1.9, 25.41.7, 28.6.5, *ib.* 16.6, 31.41.14, *ib.* 42.6, 48.11, 32.12.3, 35.29.7, *ib.* 30.11, 36.19.6, *ib.* 44.6, 38.17.6, *ib.* 39.2, 42.66.2, 45.1.9; *aut* 10.45.11, 24.16.4, *ib.* 20.6, 40.14, 25.1.4, 26.40.8, 29.33.6, *ib.* 34.16, 30.6.8, 31.21.17, *ib.* 23.8, 36.9.11, 37.24.10, *ib.* 30.8, 58.3, 38.23.3, *ib.* 5, *ib.* 39.3, 47.6, 41.11.6, *ib.* 28.8.

⁶I do not include Ter. Andr. 266, where the meaning is not, “now this way, now that,” but “in the direction in which you choose to turn it.”

this way and that") with Att. 13.25.3 *Academiam volaticam . . . modo huc modo illuc*. As to Georg. 4.388 (Cir. 395) *qui piscibus aequor et . . . curru metitur equorum*, it may be set beside Ov. Tr. 2.527 *sic madidos digitis siccatur Venus uda capillos et modo maternis tecta videtur aquis*, where the insertion of *modo* makes clearer the fact that the goddess is represented, not as doing two things at once, but in two separate poses. And Stat. Silv. 1.2.135 *huic pennas et cornua sumeret aethrae rector* is also a good parallel to the Virgilian passage, if we remember that the latter might be paraphrased, not only by *modo—modo*, but also by asyndetic repetition of the pronoun. If Statius had written *huic pennas, huic cornua* he would have made somewhat more definite what, even with *et*, we know to be meant, that the two disguises are alternatives. Of course *vel* or *aut* might be used, but *et* is not a substitute for one of these; it expresses a different manner of envisaging the alternatives.

This difference in the point of view from which associated facts may be regarded, and the consequent different expression by one or other of the two particles, is further illustrated by the following examples, in which phrases of a like tenor exhibit varyingly the disjunctive or the copulative: Livy 31.11.17 *si quid ad eas addi, demi mutarive vellet*, Thuc. 5.23.6 *ἦν δέ τι δοκῇ προσθεῖναι καὶ ἀφελεῖν*; B. G. 5.30.3 *aut ferro aut fame intereant*, B. Alex. 60.1 *ferro flammaque consumerentur*; Tac. Ann. 1.9 *vita eius varie extollebatur arguebaturque*, ib. 25 *diversis animorum motibus pavebant terrebantque*; ib. 28 *prout splendidior obscuriorve laetari aut maerere*, Plin. N. H. 16.19 *pro differentia generum breviora vel longiora*, Ter. Hec. 380 *ut res dant sese, ita magni atque humiles sumus*, Sen. D. 1.1.4 *subeunt ampliores minoresque, prout illas lunare sidus elicit*; Plin. N. H. 14.52 *in Rubrum litus Indicumve merces petitas*, ibid. *digna opera quae in Caecubis Setinisque agris proficeret*, Catull. 45.5 *solus in Libya Indiaque tosta | caesio veniam obvius leoni*, Ulp. Dig. 49.15.24 *ab hostibus autem captus, ut puta a Germanis et Parthis*; Plin. N. H. 2.229 *fons eodem quo Nilus modo ac pariter cum eo decrescit augeturque*, ibid. *pariter cum aestu maris crescunt minuunturque*; Tac. D. 35 *tyrannicidarum praemia aut etc.*, ib. 1 *causidici et etc.*; Bacon, Essay XXIX "Princes are like to heavenly bodies, which cause good or evil times," Essay XI "In place there is licence to do good and

evil"; Gardiner, *Hist. of England* I, 48 "Every political movement involved a question of life or death to the nation," *N. Y. Times*, Oct. 27, 1919 "This is a matter of life and death to the women and children of the miners' families"; Moore, *Diary* i 302 "prevent them from plundering and ill-using the inhabitants," Fortescue i 57 "robbery of churches or peasants"; *ibid.* 86 "rejecting all who were physically deficient or imperfectly armed," p. 126 "for the relief of poor, indigent and aged soldiers."

I doubt if "and" in Catull. l. c. and in the common English phrase, "a matter of life and death," can be defended as logical; here the parallelism of the two particles seems to have brought about the same result, trespass by "and" on the field of "or," that we found to occur with numerals and in the corrective phrases. In all the other cases "and" is normal; Ulpian's participle is equivalent to a relative clause, so that a *Germanis et Parthis* (captus) = *qui a Germanis quique a Parthis captus est*; cp. *Æn.* 5.67, 6.612 (but 610 *aut qui*), *Sall. C.* 14.2 (but 3 *aut* with participles).

The fact that distribution may be expressed by contrasted nouns or adverbs, as well as by the particles, leads to a mingling of expressions; the noun or adverb is (1) combined with, (2) set over against, the particle. (1) *Cic. de Or.* 3.198 *terna aut bina aut nonnulli singula verba dicebant*, *Plin. N. H.* 10.112 *percusso semel, aliquae et gemino ictu, aëre feruntur* (the fact that Pliny uses *et* = *etiam*, not *et* = *que*, seems to me to make no difference in the general character of the expression); (2) *Cic. de Div.* 2.121 *Venerium iaciat aliquando, nonnumquam iterum ac tertium*, *Verg. Buc.* 1.65 f., 10.130 f., *Plin. N. H.* 7.38 *alius septimo mense, alius octavo et* (that is *alius alio mense*; we might say "and so on") *usque ad initium undecimi*, 10.113 *sine voce non volant multae aut e contrario semper in volatu silent*,⁷ 14.15 *hic purpureo lucent colore, illic fulgent roseo nitentque viridi*, *Spartian. Hel.* 5.10 *Boream alium, alium*

⁷ "An *aliae pro aut*" Mayhoff, an unnecessary conjecture which interprets the sense. Cp. *Serv. Aen.* 2.124 *multi bis intelligendum*, *id. ib.* 10.131 *subaudiendum alii atque alii*. Noteworthy is the shift in *Liv.* 45.31.1 *in qua cognitione magis utra pars Romanis, utra regi, favisset, quaesitum est quam utri fecissent iniuriam aut accepissent*.

Notum, et item Aquilonem aut Circium ceterisque nominibus appellans.

In both Latin and English the distributive disjunctive is a convenient abbreviation for "the former—the latter" and like phrases: Tac. G. 1 a Sarmatis Dacisque mutuo metu aut montibus separantur, ib. 4 frigora atque inedia caelo solove adsue-runt (tolerare), Ann. 1.55 insigni utrumque perfidia in nos aut fide, Moore, *Diary* i 307 "Some people were observed on foot or on horseback," Grant, *Memoirs* i 314 "Most of the killed and wounded fell outside . . . and were buried or cared for by Buckner," Bacon, Ess. xxix "When the Lacedaemonians and Athenians made war to set up or pull down democracies and oligarchies"—where the monosyllable saves the author from having to write "the former to pull down democracies and set up oligarchies, the latter to pull down oligarchies and set up democracies."

The use of the distributive copulative with numerals is especially to be noted: Michelet "On les pendit par vingt et par trente" (translating the words of a medieval chronicler, illic viginti illic triginta . . . suspendens), Thuc. 4.32.3 διέστησαν κατὰ διακοσίους τε καὶ πλείους, ἔστι δ' ἡ ἐλάσσους, Xen. Anab. 4.8.21 τρίτῃ δὲ καὶ τετάρτῃ ἀνίσταντο ("some on the third, some on the fourth day"), Plat. Phaed. 63 Ε ἀναγκάζεσθαι καὶ δις καὶ τρὶς πίνειν τοὺς τι τοιοῦτον ποιοῦντας, Moore "It was not until the 11th and 12th that we reached this bay" ("we" being the different ships of the fleet), Dana, *Two Years* "buy shoes at three and four dollars a pair," ibid. "These horses were bought at from two to six and eight dollars apiece," Varr. R. R. 2.8.3 tricenis ac quadragenis milibus admissarii aliquot venierunt, B. G. 3.15.1 singulas binae ac ternae naves circumsteterant (Holmes, *Conquest of Gaul* p. 91 "Two or more galleys rowed up close to one of the enemy's ships"), B. G. 5.14.4, Liv. 28.2.8, Sen. Controv. 1.9 praef. 4, Plin. N. H. 8.35 (dracones) quaternos quinosque inter se cratium modo amplexos, 16.202, Capitol. Gord. 19.3, Vopise. Aurelian. 26.4. So "and" is used in English with "by" and "in": Shakesp. W. T. 1.2.438 "And will by twos and threes at several posterns Clear them o' the city," *New Statesman* "The police are never allowed to go out in the daytime except in twos and threes." Noteworthy is Bacon's phrase, Ess. xxi "Like Sibulla's

offer, which at first offereth the commodity at full, then consumeth part and part, and still holds up the price."

English does not, I think, exhibit the association of the two particles with each other in the same sentence, which in Latin appears in two ways, (1) different combinations having different particles, (2) the particles varying in the same combination: (1) Sall. C. 14.3 quos manus atque lingua periurio aut sanguine civili alebat, Suet. Jul. 26 nullum largitionis aut officiorum genus publice privatimque omisit, Liv. 21.1.2, Tac. D. 15 *fin.*, H. 1.62, Sil. 1.427; (2) Catull. 25.3 vel pene languido senis situque araneoso, Val. Fl. 8.90 ceu refluens Padus aut septem proiectus in amnes Nilus et Hesperium veniens Alpheus in orbem, Hor. C. 3.27.2 ff., Prop. 2.1.27 ff., Ov. Tr. 1.11.15, Plin. N. H. 14.119, Sen. D. 4.3.2, Luc. 2.199 f.; cp. in Tac. D. 18 quosque, in Sen. D. 2.9.2 quaque, following on *aut*.

The use of *et* or *que* after a negative was recognized by Bentley on Luc. 2.354; cp. Luc. 1.65, 5.454, Plin. N. H. 8.28 nec amplius quam semel gignere pluresque quam singulos, Mart. 2.11.9 nihil colonus vilicusque decoxit, Tibull. 2.4.17, Ov. Her. 2.90, Sil. 1.427. It is found also in English: Bacon "it seeth not dangers and inconveniences," Clarendon "he was not received and avowed," Stevenson "not pained by personal attention and remark," Dowden "with no private and personal motive." I believe that the disjunctive is more usual in both languages, but have no statistics. In French *ni* is regular, and Littré notes no other usage; but Plattner, *Ausführl. Gram. d. franz. Spr.* (a reference for which I am indebted to my colleague, Professor E. B. Davis) recognizes the employment of *et* and *ou*; add to his examples Voltaire, *Poésies Mêlées* 136 "Jamais dans Athènes et dans Rome On n'eut de plus beaux jours ni de plus dignes prix"; Carlyle, quoting and translating this, turns *et* into "or." In Latin the two particles may alternate with each other and with *non* or *neque*: Georg. 2.495 ff., 4.210 ff., Prop. 2.1.19 ff., Stat. Ach. 1.436 f., Sil. 1.171 ff., Mart. 6.42.3 ff., Tac. D. 40 ne Macedonum quidem ac Persarum aut ullius gentis.

Under the same head belongs the use of the copulative with *sine* and in questions. Of the latter I have only three examples: Mart. 7.95.5, Ov. Tr. 2.344, Cic. Fam. 3.11.2; contrast (though not interrogative) Fam. 15.4.14. The former, as is well known, varies with the use of the disjunctive; Tac. Ann. 1.1 sine ira et

studio, Agr. 1 sine gratia aut ambitione; I have not collected examples. "And" is found in earlier English after *sans*, Oxf. Dict. VIII, pt. 2.98; and I find in Shakespeare, K. J. 3.4.51, "Without eyes, ears, and harmful sound of words." But the other six Shakespearian examples that I have been able to collect from Schmidt's *Lexicon* and Bartlett's *Concordance* have "or"; and contrast the linking of synonyms by the copulative in Sall. Jug. 41.9, Liv. 26.48.11, with English "without stop or stay" (Prior, Scott). German renders French *sans peur et sans reproche*, or *sans peur ni reproche*, by *ohne Furcht und Tadel*; Muret-Sanders, ii, 1523, cite *ohne Hut und Stock*, with which compare Suet. Aug. 10 sine paludamento equoque and contrast Dana's "without shoes or stockings." Goethe's "ohne Spielerei und Anmassung" shows the copulative with words of different signification, Bacon's "without insolency or bravery" and Milton's "without all doubt or controversy" the disjunctive with words of kindred meaning.

Wagner explained *que* in Æn. 2.37 as marking a subdivision: "prior quidem sententia in duas solvitur . . . aut abolendam machinam . . . aut terebrandam censent." The following passages might perhaps be cited in confirmation: Vell. 1.12.3 qui nihil in vita nisi laudandum aut fecit aut dixit ac sensit, Sen. D. 2.10.4 dolor corporis et debilitas aut amicorum liberorumque amissio et patriae bello flagrantis calamitas (where, however, Wagner's theory could not apply to the second *et*), Tac. Agr. 22 nullum . . . castellum aut vi hostium expugnatum aut pactione ac fuga desertum,⁸ Dig. 1.12.1.10 contemni se a liberto dixerit vel convicium se ab eo passum liberosque suos vel uxorem, 4.6.1.1 cum is metus aut sine dolo malo rei publicae causa abesset inve vinculis servitute hostiumque potestate esset. But a similar effect may be produced by a disjunctive which varies with a copulative or by a change from one disjunctive to another: (1) Plin. N. H. 11.212 bisulca scissive in digitos pedibus et cornigera, 16.140 venatus classisve et imagines rerum, Capitol. Gord. 21.4 quos servos habuerit . . . et quos amicos et quot paenulas quotve clamydes; (2) Plin. N. H. 1. praef. 12

*Professor Stuart's rendering, in his edition, "*retreat as a result of negotiations*; hence, *capitulation*," raises the question whether *fuga* can denote a retreat without any pursuit, actual or feared. I do not know if there are examples of such a sense.

excessus aut orationes sermonesve aut casus mirabiles vel eventus varios, 11.13 aut temporum locorumve mutata ratio est aut erraverunt priores, 17.166 iugum fit pertica aut harundine aut crine funiculove, Sen. D. 4.35.5 quales sunt hostium vel ferarum caede madentium aut ad caedem euntium adspectus. The effect thus created of emphasizing the connection in signification or construction between two members of a series might seem thus to be brought about, not especially by the employment of the copulative, but by any variation of the particles, were it not that they vary also in cases where no such effect is produced; it would seem therefore as if the variation were made only for the sake of syllabic harmony or to avoid monotonous repetition.

Divergence of Latin from English usage occurs with the disjunctive as well as with the copulative: Liv. 24.45.3 ad Faleriorum Pyrrhive proditorem tertium transfugis documentum esset, Mart. 11.31.5 has prima feret alterave cena, | has cena tibi tertia reponet, Liv. 26.8.6 aut quanto (commented on by Weissenborn), Tac. D. 33 didici quid aut illi scirint aut nos nesciamus, G. 38 ut ament amenturve, Agr. 10 aderescere aut resorberi. On Plin. N. H. 10.123 adeo satis iusta causa populo Romano visa est exsequiarum ingenium avis aut supplicii de cive Romano, Mayhoff queries "An potius *ac*?" Pliny's *aut* is not odder than Horace's *et* in Sat. 1.6.42, which editors pass by without comment. Whether we render *atque*, *ibid.* 77, by "and" or "or," depends on whether we render *quivis* by "every" or by "any." Where each of the two points of view, that which couples and that which disjoins, is equally correct, the only question that arises is whether in a given language idiomatic usage admits either particle indifferently or excludes the one in favor of the other. The occasional use of either in a context where it is logically indefensible seems to arise from pushing parallelism too far; because the two particles may often be employed at choice, they are sometimes treated as possible alternatives in cases where such treatment is unjustified.

W. H. KIRK.